



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,642	05/03/2001	Shunpei Yamazaki	SEL 258	7227
7590	12/14/2004		EXAMINER	
COOK, ALEX, MCFARRON, MANZO, CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD. Suite 2850 200 West Adams St. Chicago, IL 60606			SCHECHTER, ANDREW M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	
			DATE MAILED: 12/14/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/848,642	YAMAZAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Andrew Schechter	Art Unit 2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,6-9,11-14,16,18-34 and 43-84 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,6-9,11-14,16,18-34 and 43-84 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 27 September 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues [p. 22] that *Ikeda* and *Fujikawa* should not be combined and the required motivation to combine is lacking, apparently because *Ikeda* discloses a color filter substrate and *Fujikawa* discloses a black matrix on the side of the active matrix TFT. This is not persuasive. First, if this is meant to imply that *Ikeda* and *Fujikawa* are non-analogous arts, the examiner does not agree. Second, *Fujikawa* is used by the examiner to present evidence of the location (in plane view) of the light shield, specifically, what the light shield should overlap. For this purpose, it is irrelevant on what substrate *Fujikawa*'s black matrix is located. The modification to *Ikeda* would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated by the teaching provided by *Fujikawa*.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 58 is objected to because of the following informalities: "in a driving circuit" should be "in a driving circuit region" or similar, since neither the light shielding portion nor the orientation film is part of the driving circuit, and the present language is unnecessarily confusing. Appropriate correction is required.

3. Claims 79-84 are objected to because of the following informalities: they recite "an electrical equipment" and "the electro-optical device" instead of "a portable telephone having a display portion". Appropriate correction is required.
4. Claims 55, 64, 73, 75, 82, and 84 are objected to because of the following informalities: they should depend on claims 54, 63, 72, 72, 81, and 81, respectively. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 67-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Yokomizu*, Japanese Patent Document No. 10-073813. (A machine-translation of the reference was provided to the applicant in a previous office action.)

Yokomizu discloses [see Figs. 1 and 2, and consider the 4th black matrix from either left or right in Fig. 1] an electrical equipment having a display portion including a first colored layer [21B], a second colored layer [21R], and a third colored layer [21G],

Art Unit: 2871

wherein a light shielding portion [21BM] comprises said first colored layer and said second colored layer. Claim 67 is therefore anticipated.

The first colored layer is blue, the second is red, and the third is green, so claim 68 is also anticipated. The light shielding portion is provided under an opposing substrate [20], so claim 69 is also anticipated. The device is a transmission type liquid crystal display device [paragraph 0017] in which a pixel electrode [13] is made of a transparent conductive film [paragraph 0018], so claim 70 is also anticipated.

7. Claims 67-70, 72, and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Okubo et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 4,470,667.

Okubo discloses [see Figs. 3; 4, 11, and 12, for instance] an electrical equipment comprising a first colored layer [110], a second colored layer [112], and a third colored layer [111], wherein a light shielding portion comprises said first colored layer and said second colored layer [see Fig. 11]. Claim 67 is therefore anticipated.

The first layer is blue, the second red, the third green, so claim 68 is also anticipated. The light shielding portion is provided under an opposing substrate, so claim 69 is also anticipated. When used in a transmission LCD [col. 6, line 31] the pixel electrode [4, etc.] is made of a transparent conductive film [col. 7, lines 11-13], so claim 70 is also anticipated. A pixel electrode [4, etc.] is connected to a thin film transistor and said light shielding portion [taken to be the portion over the TFT] is formed overlapping a channel forming region of the thin film transistor [see Figs. 11 and 12], so claim 72 is also anticipated. The light shielding portion [taken to be the portion along

the horizontal bus line between two TFTs, where only two colored layers overlap] does not include said third colored layer [see Fig. 11], so claim 74 is also anticipated.

8. Claims 67-69 and 71-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Fujioka et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,552,764.

Fujioka discloses [see Fig. 16] an electrical equipment including a first colored layer [106C] and a second colored layer [106A], and a third colored layer [106B], and wherein a light shielding portion [above the TFT on the right] comprises the first and second colored layers. Claim 67 is therefore anticipated.

The first is blue, the second red, the third green, so claim 68 is anticipated. The light shielding portion is provided under an opposing substrate, so claim 69 is anticipated. The device can be a personal computer including the LCD, so claim 71 is anticipated. There is a pixel electrode [202] connected to a TFT formed over the substrate, and said light shielding portion is formed overlapping a channel forming region of the TFT, so claim 72 is anticipated. The liquid crystal is between the light shielding portion and the channel forming region, so claim 73 is anticipated. The light shielding portion does not include the third colored layer, so claim 74 is anticipated.

9. Claims 67-70 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Ikeda et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,671,025.

In discussing the Eleventh Embodiment [col. 28, line 56ff], *Ikeda* discloses that any of the “configurations shown in the first to seventh embodiments may be applied as a configuration of the TFT substrate” matched to the color filter [CF] substrate disclosed in the eleventh embodiment [which is shown in Fig. 40A]. *Ikeda* therefore gives explicit

Art Unit: 2871

fruition to using the color filter substrate shown in Fig. 40A with the TFT substrate shown in Figs. 3-4 (first embodiment), for instance.

/keda discloses [see Figs. 40A, and Figs. 3-4 where the color filter substrate 40 has been replaced with the color filter substrate of Fig. 40A] an electrical equipment comprising a first colored layer [173B], a second colored layer [173R], and a third colored layer [173G]; wherein a light shielding portion [172] comprises said first colored layer and said second colored layer. Claim 67 is therefore anticipated.

The first layer is blue, the second red, the third green, so claim 68 is also anticipated. The light shielding portion is provided under an opposing substrate [171], so claim 69 is also anticipated. The electro-optical device is a transmission type LCD [col. 6, line 39 – col. 7, line 43 – both pixel and opposing electrode are transparent, both substrates are glass, and there are polarizers on both substrates, hence this is a transmission LCD as opposed to a reflection LCD] in which a pixel electrode [32] is made of a transparent conductive film [ITO, col. 7, line 7], so claim 70 is also anticipated. The light shielding portion does not include said third colored layer, so claim 74 is also anticipated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2871

11. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20-23, 25-27, 29-32, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ikeda et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,671,025 in view of *Fujikawa*, U.S. Patent No. 6,002,463.

In discussing the Eleventh Embodiment [col. 28, line 56ff], *Ikeda* discloses that any of the “configurations shown in the first to seventh embodiments may be applied as a configuration of the TFT substrate” matched to the color filter [CF] substrate disclosed in the eleventh embodiment [which is shown in Fig. 40A]. *Ikeda* therefore gives explicit fruition to using the color filter substrate shown in Fig. 40A with the TFT substrate shown in Figs. 3-4 (first embodiment), for instance.

Ikeda discloses [see Figs. 40A, and Figs. 3-4 where the color filter substrate 40 has been replaced with the color filter substrate of Fig. 40A] an electro-optical device comprising a pixel electrode [32] provided over a substrate and a thin film transistor [37] formed over a substrate [31]; a light shielding portion [172] consisting essentially of a first colored layer [173B] and a second colored layer [173R]; wherein the light shielding portion is provided under an opposing substrate [171]; and wherein a liquid crystal layer is between said light shielding portion and the regions on the other substrate.

Ikeda discloses that the black matrix in Figs. 3-4 (the equivalent of the light shielding portion in Fig. 40A] is disposed over the drain and gate bus lines, the auxiliary capacitance electrodes, and the TFTs on the TFT substrate [col. 7, lines 30-33], which suggests that the light shielding portion shown in Fig. 40A would be similarly disposed. However, *Ikeda* does not explicitly disclose where (in plane view) the light shielding portion is disposed when combining the CF of Fig. 40A with the TFT substrate of Fig. 3.

Fujikawa discloses forming the light shielding portion [black matrix] overlapping with the channel forming region of the switching element (thin film transistor) and covering the regions between adjacent pixel electrodes [see Fig. 4]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do so with the light shielding portion shown in Fig. 40A placed on the TFT substrate shown in Fig. 3, motivated by *Fujikawa*'s teaching that the function of a black matrix is to prevent "a decrease in display contrast due to back light transmission between a transparent pixel electrode of indium tin oxide (ITO) and its circumferential wiring and the like [that is, between adjacent pixel electrodes], and a decrease in display quality due to leakage current excited by incident light at the channel region of a thin film transistor" [col. 1, lines 24-29].

The electro-optical device is a transmission type LCD [col. 6, line 39 – col. 7, line 43 – both pixel and opposing electrode are transparent, both substrates are glass, and there are polarizers on both substrates, hence this is a transmission LCD as opposed to a reflection LCD] in which a (first or second) pixel electrode [32], electrically connected with the switching element, is made of a transparent conductive film [ITO, col. 7, line 7].

In the device of *Ikeda* in view of *Fujikawa*, the liquid crystal [49] is positioned between the light shielding portion on the color filter substrate and the channel forming region as recited in claims 1 and 8, and between the light shielding portion and said regions (between adjacent first and second pixel electrodes) as recited in claim 13. Claims 1, 8, and 13 are therefore unpatentable.

There are a plurality of pixel openings [see Fig. 40A], with one of a part extended from the first colored layer, a part extended from the second colored layer, and a third colored layer, provided on each of said plurality of pixel openings. The said light shielding portion does not include a third colored layer [173G], so claims 21, 25, and 29 are also unpatentable.

As noted above, a switching element [the TFT 37] is connected [col. 7, lines 9-11] to said (first) pixel electrode [32], so claims 16, 20, 31, and 34 are also unpatentable.

The first colored layer is blue [173B], the second red [173R], so claims 2, 9, and 14 are unpatentable.

The third colored layer is green [173G], so claims 22, 26, and 30 are also unpatentable.

The electro-optical device is a transmission type LCD [col. 6, line 39 – col. 7, line 43 – both pixel and opposing electrode are transparent, both substrates are glass, and there are polarizers on both substrates, hence this is a transmission LCD as opposed to a reflection LCD] in which a pixel electrode [32] is made of a transparent conductive film [ITO, col. 7, line 7], so claims 6, 11, 18, 23, 27, and 32 are also unpatentable.

12. Claims 7, 12, 19, 24, 28, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ikeda et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,671,025 in view of *Fujikawa*, U.S. Patent No. 6,002,463 as applied to claims 1, 8, 13, 21, 25, and 29 above, and further in view of *Ogawa et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,373,377.

Ikeda and *Fujikawa* do not disclose that the electro-optical device is a personal computer, for instance. *Ogawa* does disclose an analogous liquid crystal display electro-optical device which is a personal computer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the LCD of *Ikeda* in view of *Fujikawa* into a personal computer (making the personal computer the electro-optical device), motivated by *Ogawa*'s teaching that "liquid crystal displays ... weigh light, permit a decrease in thickness, and consume only a small amount of electric power, and owing to these benefits, have found utility in such applications as ... lap-top personal computers" [col. 1, lines 12-17]. Claims 7, 12, 19, 24, 28, and 33 are therefore unpatentable.

13. Claims 43-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ikeda et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,671,025 in view of *Fujikawa*, U.S. Patent No. 6,002,463 as applied to claims 1, 8, 13, 21, 25, and 29 above, and further in view of *Ukai et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,576,858.

Ikeda does not disclose the additional limitations of dependent claims 43-48, namely a gate-on-top TFT, but rather discloses a gate-on-bottom TFT. *Ukai* discloses [see Fig. 8] an analogous LCD with a gate-on-top TFT: source line [8S] connected with the switching element [8SC, etc.] electrically; an insulating film [15] over the source line; and a gate wiring [8G] over said insulating film and over said source line. The gate-on-top TFT is an art-recognized equivalent to the gate-on-bottom TFT, as evidenced by *Ukai*'s discussion [see Figs. 8 and 9, col. 9, lines 8-45]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use such a gate-on-top TFT

structure in the device of *Ikeda*, motivated by the two being art-recognized equivalents, as evidenced by *Ukai*. Claims 43-48 are therefore unpatentable.

14. Claim 75 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fujioka et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,552,764 as applied to claim 72 above, in view of *Ukai et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,576,858 as applied above.

Fujioka does not necessarily use a gate-on-top TFT. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do so as disclosed by *Ukai*, motivated as discussed above. Claim 75 is therefore unpatentable.

15. Claims 76-78 and 80-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fujioka et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,552,764 as applied to claims 67-69 and 71-74 above.

Fujioka does not explicitly disclose using the LCD in a portable telephone. The examiner takes official notice that the use of LCDs as displays in portable telephones is well-known; it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do so, motivated by it being useful in a phone. Claims 76-78 and 80-83 are therefore unpatentable.

16. Claims 76-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yokomizu*, Japanese Patent Document No. 10-073813 as applied to claims 67-70 above.

Yokomizu does not explicitly disclose using the LCD in a portable telephone. The examiner takes official notice that the use of LCDs as displays in portable telephones is well-known; it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention to do so, motivated by it being useful in a phone. Claims 76-78 and 80-83 are therefore unpatentable.

17. Claim 84 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fujioka et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,552,764 as applied to claim 81 above, in view of *Ukai et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,576,858 as applied above.

Fujioka does not necessarily use a gate-on-top TFT. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do so as disclosed by *Ukai*, motivated as discussed above. Claim 84 is therefore unpatentable.

18. Claims 49-51 and 53-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fujioka et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,552,764 as applied to claims 67-69 and 71-74 above, and further in view of *Kaneko et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,637,380.

Fujioka does not explicitly disclose using a leveling film over the light shielding portion. *Kaneko* discloses such a leveling film [3] to be used in an analogous situation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do so here, motivated by *Kaneko*'s teaching that it removes non-uniformity and improves the display quality. Claims 49-51 and 53-56 are therefore unpatentable.

19. Claims 49-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yokomizu*, Japanese Patent Document No. 10-073813 as applied to claims 67-70 above, and further in view of *Kaneko et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,637,380.

Yokomizu does not explicitly disclose using a leveling film over the light shielding portion. *Kaneko* discloses such a leveling film [3] to be used in an analogous situation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to do so here, motivated by *Kaneko*'s teaching that it removes non-uniformity and improves the display quality. Claims 49-52 are therefore unpatentable.

20. Claim 57 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fujioka et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,552,764 in view of *Kaneko et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,637,380 as applied to claim 54 above, in view of *Ukai et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,576,858 as applied above.

Fujioka does not necessarily use a gate-on-top TFT. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do so as disclosed by *Ukai*, motivated as discussed above. Claim 57 is therefore unpatentable.

21. Claims 58-60 and 62-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fujioka et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,552,764 as applied to claims 67-69 and 71-74 above, and further in view of *Ichikawa et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,339,459.

Fujioka does not explicitly disclose a part of the light shielding portion overlaps with an orientation film in a driving circuit region. *Ichikawa* discloses [see Fig. 11] an analogous LCD where the driving circuit [peripheral] region is shielded by a light shielding portion [220] overlapped with an orientation film [1110, 1111]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do so here, motivated by the desire to light shield the driving circuitry (both protecting them and preventing image defects in the periphery) and to conveniently form an orientation film on the substrate in order to properly orient the liquid crystal molecules. Claims 58-60 and 62-65 are therefore unpatentable.

22. Claims 58-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yokomizu*, Japanese Patent Document No. 10-073813 as applied to claims 67-70 above, and further in view of *Ichikawa et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,339,459.

Yokomizu does not explicitly disclose a part of the light shielding portion overlaps with an orientation film in a driving circuit region. *Ichikawa* discloses [see Fig. 11] an analogous LCD where the driving circuit [peripheral] region is shielded by a light shielding portion [220] overlapped with an orientation film [1110, 1111]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do so here, motivated by the desire to light shield the driving circuitry (both protecting them and preventing image defects in the periphery) and to conveniently form an orientation film on the substrate in order to properly orient the liquid crystal molecules. Claims 58-61 are therefore unpatentable.

23. Claim 66 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fujioka et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,552,764 in view of *Ichikawa et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,339,459 as applied to claim 54 above, in view of *Ukai et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,576,858 as applied above.

Fujioka does not necessarily use a gate-on-top TFT. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do so as disclosed by *Ukai*, motivated as discussed above. Claim 66 is therefore unpatentable.

Conclusion

24. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Schechter whose telephone number is (571) 272-2302. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on (571) 272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrew Schechter
Andrew Schechter
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800
10 December 2004